arXiv:1212.0953v1 [gr-qc] 5 Dec 2012

# Origin of probabilities and their application to the multiverse

Andreas Albrecht and Daniel Phillips
*University of California at Davis; Department of Physics*
*One Shields Avenue; Davis, CA 95616*

We argue using simple models that all successful practical uses of probabilities originate in quantum fluctuations in the microscopic physical world around us, often propagated to macroscopic scales. Thus we claim there is no physically verified fully classical theory of probability. We comment on the general implications of this view, and specifically question the application of classical probability theory to cosmology in cases where key questions are known to have no quantum answer.

We use the concept of probability extensively in science, and very broadly in everyday life. Many probabilistic tools used to "quantify our ignorance" seem intuitive even to non-scientists. For example, if we consider the value of one bit we know nothing about, we are inclined to assign probabilities to each value. Furthermore, it seems natural to give it a "50-50" chance of being 0 or 1. This everyday intuition is often believed to have deep theoretical justification based in "classical probability theory" (developed in famous works such as [1]).

Here we argue that the success of such intuition is fundamentally rooted in specific physical properties of the world around us. In our view the things we call "classical probabilities" can be seen as originating in the quantum probabilities that govern the microscopic world, suitably propagated by physical processes so as to be relevant on classical scales. From this perspective the validity of assigning equal probabilities to the two states of an unknown bit can be quantified by understanding the particular physical processes that connect quantum fluctuations in the microscopic world to that particular bit. The fact that we have simple beliefs about how to assign probabilities that do not directly refer to complicated processes of physical propagation is simply a reflection of the intuition we have built up by living in a world where these processes behave in a particular way. In this article we spell out and advocate this second point of view.

Our position has implications for how we use probabilities in general, but here we emphasize applications to cosmology which originally motivated our interest in this topic. Specifically, we question a number of applications of probabilities to cosmology which are popular today.

We start by outlining, using a toy model, the nature of the problem in certain cosmology theories which seem to explicitly require the use of classical probabilities. Next we give illustrations to support our view that the physical world around us has the necessary properties to give a quantum origin to all probabilities as they are usually used. We use a simple billiard ball model to argue that everyday gases and liquids are excellent amplifiers of the quantum fluctuations of their microscopic components, and then apply these results to a simple neuroscience-based model of the uncertainty of a coin flip. We thus argue that the uncertainty in the outcome of a coin flip may be fully attributable to the quantum fluctuations of the physical systems involved. We then analyze another application of probabilities (betting on digits of $\pi$) and argue that in that case too the probabilities have a quantum origin, despite appearances otherwise. We end by assessing the implications of our position.

It is commonplace in cosmology to contemplate a "multiverse" (often in the context of "eternal inflation" [2]) in which many equivalent copies of a given observer appear in the theory. As pointed out by Page [3], even if one knew the full wavefunction for such a theory it would be impossible to make predictions about future observations using probabilities derived from that wavefunction. The problem arises because multiverse theories are expected to contain many copies of the observer (sometimes said to be in different "pocket universes") that are identical in terms of all current data, but which differ in details of their environments that affect outcomes of future experiments (e.g. experiments measuring neutrino masses or cosmological perturbations). Because in these theories it is impossible to construct appropriate projection operators to describe measurements where one does not know which part of the Hilbert space (i.e. which copy of us and our environment) is being measured, the outcomes of future measurements are ill-posed quantum questions which cannot be answered within the theory.

We illustrate this problem with a very simple example. Consider a system comprised of two two-state subsystems called "$A$" and "$B$". The whole system is spanned by the four basis states constructed as products of basis states of the two subsystems: $\left\{|1\rangle^A|1\rangle^B, |1\rangle^A|2\rangle^B, |2\rangle^A|1\rangle^B, |2\rangle^A|2\rangle^B\right\}$. For the whole system in state $|\psi\rangle$, the probability assigned to measurement outcome "$i$" can be expressed as $\langle\psi|\,\hat{P}_i\,|\psi\rangle$ for a suitably chosen projection operator $\hat{P}_i$. One can readily construct projection operators corresponding to measuring system "$A$" in the "1" state (regardless of the state of the "$B$" subsystem) ($\hat{P}_1^A \equiv \left(|1\rangle^A|1\rangle^B {}^B\langle 1|\, {}^A\langle 1|\right) + \left(|1\rangle^A|2\rangle^B {}^B\langle 2|\, {}^A\langle 1|\right)$), and a similar operator $\hat{P}_1^B$ can be constructed for measuring only subsystem "$B$". Operators such as $\hat{P}_{12} \equiv |1\rangle^A|2\rangle^B {}^B\langle 2|\, {}^A\langle 1|$ represent measurements of *both* subsystems in particular states.

The problem arises because there is no projection operator that gives the probability of outcome "1" when the subsystem to be measured ("$A$" or "$B$") is undetermined. That is an ill-posed question in the quantum theory. As Page emphasizes, this is the kind of question one needs to address in order to make predictions in the multiverse, where our lack of knowledge about which pocket universe we occupy corresponds to "$A$" vs. "$B$" not being determined in the toy model. Such ill-posed quantum questions exist in laboratory situations but there are sufficiently many well-posed problems that we tend not to be concerned. Also, in the laboratory it is often possible to modify the setup so there is a measurable "label" that does identify "$A$" vs. "$B$", thus resolving the problem. But such a resolution is believed not to be possible in many cosmological cases. (There is also an interesting relationship between this issue and the (anti)symmetric wavefunctions required for identical particles [4].)

A natural response to this issue is to appeal to classical ideas about probabilities to "fill in the gap". In particular, if one could assign classical probabilities $p_A$ and $p_B$ for the measurement to be made on the respective subsystems, then one could answer the question posed above (the probability of the outcome "1" with the subsystem to be measured undetermined) by giving:

$$p_1 = p_A \langle\psi| \hat{P}_1^A |\psi\rangle + p_B \langle\psi| \hat{P}_1^B |\psi\rangle . \tag{1}$$

Note that the values of $p_A$ and $p_B$ are *not* determined from $|\psi\rangle$, and instead provide additional information specially introduced so one can write Eqn. 1. Although $p_1$ can be written as the expectation value of $\hat{P}_1 = p_A\hat{P}_1^A + p_B\hat{P}_1^B$, the operator $\hat{P}_1$ is not a projection operator ($\hat{P}_1\hat{P}_1 \neq \hat{P}_1$), thus confirming that $p_1$ is not a probability with a fully quantum origin.

Authors who apply expressions like Eqn. 1 to cosmology [5] do not claim this gives a quantum probability. Instead they appeal to classical notions of probability along the lines we have discussed at the start of this paper. Surely one successfully introduces classical probabilities such as $p_A$ and $p_B$ all the time in everyday situations to quantify our ignorance, so why should the same approach not be used in the cosmological case?

Our view is that the two cases are completely different. We believe that in every situation where we use "classical" probabilities successfully these probabilities could in principle be derived from a wavefunction describing the full physical situation. In this context classical probabilities are just ways to estimate quantum probabilities when calculating them directly is inconvenient. Our extensive experience using classical probabilities in this way (really quantifying our *quantum* ignorance) cannot be used to justify the use of classical probabilities in situations where quantum probabilities have been clearly shown to be ill-defined and uncomputable. Translating the formal framework from one situation to the other is not an extrapolation but the creation of a brand new conceptual framework that needs to be justified on its own.

We are only challenging the ad hoc introduction of classical probabilities such as $p_A$ and $p_B$. We are not criticizing the use of standard ideas from probability theory to manipulate and interpret probabilities that have a physical origin [6] . Of course we never know the wavefunction completely (and thus often write states as density matrices). Our claim is that probabilities are only proven and reliable tools if they have clear values determined from the quantum state, despite our uncertainties about it.

We next use some simple calculations to argue that it is realistic to expect all probabilities we normally use to have a quantum origin. Consider a gas of idealized billiards with radius $r$, mean free path $l$,average speed $\bar{v}$ and mass $m$. If two of these billiards approach each other with impact parameter $b$, the uncertainties in the transverse momentum ($\delta p_\perp$) and position ($\delta x_\perp$) contribute to an uncertainty in the impact parameter given by:

$$\Delta b = \delta x_\perp + \frac{\delta p_\perp}{m}\Delta t = \sqrt{2}\left(a + \frac{\hbar}{2a}\frac{l}{m\bar{v}}\right) \tag{2}$$

where the second equality is achieved using $\Delta t = l/\bar{v}$ and assuming a minimum uncertainty wavepacket of width $a$ in each of the two transverse directions. The value of $\Delta b$ is minimized by $a = \sqrt{\hbar l/(2m\bar{v})} \equiv \sqrt{l\lambda_{dB}/2}$. We will show that $\Delta b$ is significant even when minimized.

The local nature of subsequent collisions creates a distribution of entangled localized states reflecting the range of possible collision points implied by $\Delta b$. We estimate the width of this distribution as it fans out toward the next collision by classically propagating collisions that occur at either side of the range $\Delta b$. (Neglecting additional quantum effects increases the robustness of our argument.) The geometry of the collision amplifies uncertainties in a manner familiar from many chaotic processes [7]. The quantity

$$\Delta b_n = \Delta b \left(1 + \frac{2l}{r}\right)^n \tag{3}$$

gives the uncertainty in $b$ after $n$ collisions.

Setting $\Delta b_n = r$ and solving for $n$ determines $n_Q$, the number of collisions after which the quantum spread is so large that there is significant quantum uncertainty as to which billiard takes part in the next collision:

$$n_Q = -\frac{\log\left(\frac{\Delta b}{r}\right)}{\log\left(1 + \frac{2l}{r}\right)}. \tag{4}$$

For Table I we evaluated Eqn. 4 with different input parameters chosen to represent various physical situations.

Table I shows that water and air are so dominated by quantum fluctuations that $n_q < 1$, indicating the breakdown of Eqn. 4, but all the more strongly supporting our

| | $r$ $(m)$ | $l$ $(m)$ | $m$ $(kg)$ | $\bar{v}$ $(m/s)$ | $\lambda\!\!\!^{-}_{dB}$ $(m)$ | $\Delta b$ $(m)$ | $n_Q$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nitrogen at STP (Air) | $1.6 \times 10^{-10}$ | $3.4 \times 10^{-07}$ | $4.7^{-26}$ | 360 | $6.2 \times 10^{-12}$ | $2.9 \times 10^{-9}$ | $-0.2$ |
| Water at body temp | $3.0 \times 10^{-10}$ | $5.4 \times 10^{-10}$ | $3.0 \times 10^{-26}$ | 460 | $7.6 \times 10^{-12}$ | $1.3 \times 10^{-10}$ | 0.6 |
| Billiards game | 0.029 | 1 | 0.16 | 1 | $6.6 \times 10^{-34}$ | $4.6 \times 10^{-17}$ | 8 |
| Bumper car ride | 1 | 2 | 150 | 0.5 | $1.4 \times 10^{-36}$ | $3.4 \times 10^{-18}$ | 25 |

TABLE I. The number of collisions, ($n_Q$ from Eqn. 4) before quantum uncertainty dominates, evaluated for different physical systems that can be roughly modeled as a "gas" of billiards with different dimensions, masses and speeds. Values $n_Q < 1$ indicate that quantum fluctuations are so dominant that Eqn. 4 breaks down. All randomness (i.e. "thermal fluctuations") in these quantum dominated systems is fundamentally quantum in nature.

view that *all* randomness in these system is fundamentally quantum. This result strongly indicates that if one were able to fully model the molecules in these macroscopic systems one would find that the intrinsic quantum uncertainties of the molecules, amplified by processes of the sort we just described, would be fully sufficient to account for all the fluctuations. One would not be required to "quantify our ignorance" using the kind of purely classical probability arguments mentioned at the start of this article to fully understand the system. For example, the Boltzmann distribution for one of these systems in a thermal state should really be derivable as feature dynamically achieved by the wavefunction without appeal to formal arguments about equipartition etc. .

This argument that the randomness in collections of molecules in the world around has a fully quantum origin lies at the core of our case. We expect that all practical applications of probabilities can be traced to this intrinsic randomness in the physical world. As an illustration, we next trace the randomness of a coin flip to Brownian motion of polypeptides in the human nervous system.

Randomness in a coin flip comes from a lack of correlation between the starting and ending coin positions. The signal triggering the flip travels along human neurons which have an intrinsic temporal uncertainty of $\delta t_n \approx 1ms$ [8]. It has been argued that fluctuations in the number of open neuron ion channels can account for the observed values of $\delta t_n$ [8]. These molecular fluctuations are due to random Brownian motion of the polypeptides in their surrounding fluid. Based on our assessment that the probabilities for fluctuations in water are fundamentally quantum, we argue that the value of $\delta t_n$ realized in a given situation is also fundamentally quantum. Quantum fluctuations in the water drive the motion of the polypeptides, resulting in different numbers of ion channels being open or closed at a given moment, in a given instance realized from the many quantum possibilities.

Consider a coin flipped and caught at about the same height, by a hand moving at speed $v_h$ in the direction of the toss and with a flip imparting an additional speed $v_f$ to the coin. A neurological uncertainty in the time of flip, $\delta t_n$, results in a change in flight time $\delta t_f = \delta t_n \times v_h/(v_h + v_f)$. A similar catch time uncertainty results in a total flight time uncertainty $\delta t_t = \sqrt{2}\delta t_f$. A coin flipped upward by an impact at its edge has a rotation frequency $f = 4v_f/(\pi d)$ where $d$ is the coin diameter. The resulting uncertainty in the number of spins is $\delta N = f\delta t_t$. Using $v_h = v_f = 5m/s$ and $d = 0.01m$ (and $\delta t_n = 1ms$) gives $\delta N = 0.5$, enough to make the outcome of the coin toss completely dependent on the time uncertainty in the neurological signal which we have argued is fully quantum.

No doubt we have neglected significant factors in modeling the coin flip. The point here is that even with all our simplifications, we have a plausibility argument that the outcome of a coin flip is truly a quantum measurement (really, a Schrödinger cat) and that the 50–50 outcome of a coin toss may in principle be derived from the quantum physics of a realistic coin toss with no reference to classical notions of how we must "quantify our ignorance". Estimates such as this one illustrate how the quantum nature of fluctuations in the gasses and fluids around us can lead to a fundamental quantum basis for probabilities we care about in the macroscopic world.

The view that all practical applications of probabilities are based on quantum probabilities in the physical world seems a challenging proposition to verify. As we have illustrated with the coin flip, the path from microscopic quantum fluctuations to macroscopic phenomena is a complicated one to track. And there are endless cases one might want to check (rolling dice, choosing a random card etc.), most of them also too complicated to work through conclusively. So arguing our position on a case-by-case basis is certainly an impractical task.

On the other hand, our ideas are very easy to falsify. All one needs is one illustration of a case where classical notions of probability are useful in a situation that is clearly isolated from the quantum probabilities in the physical world. One idea for such a counterexample was proposed by Sean Carroll [9]. One could place bets on, say, the millionth digit of $\pi$. Since the digits of $\pi$ are known to be uniformly distributed [10], one should be able to use this apparently purely classical notion to win bets with someone who believes otherwise. While on the face of it this appears to be an ideal counterexample, further scrutiny reveals an essential quantum role.

To make such a bet a fair one the digit in question must be knowable (to resolve the bet), but also must be unknown to either party initially. The bet really is about the lack of correlation between the digit selection and the digit value. One can scrutinize and modify this problem extensively but quantum physics will enter into digit selection one way or another (e.g. through human neurons used in selecting a classical random number seed). It is thus quantum processes such as those discussed above that are being counted on to create the lack of correlation that is crucial to the fairness of this bet. Making a bet on the $N$th digit of $\pi$ is not a clean example of the application of pure classical probability theory.

We emphasize that just one compelling counterexample would be sufficient to undermine our position. One must identify a system that is sufficiently isolated from the quantum world so that a successful probabilistic treatment can be fully attributed to purely classical ideas about probabilities. (Here "successful" should result in a real practical outcome, such as winning bets against someone who does not believe the correct classical probabilities.) While we do not feel the bet on $\pi$ is a good example, it may point the way to a successful one. Once the practical value of purely classical thinking about probabilities is established there is no reason to think it should not be applicable to more than one situation.

Our arguments depend crucially on what may seem to be "accidental" levels of quantum noise in the physical world. Our point is that accidental or not, we count on this quantum noise to produce the uncorrelated microscopic states that lie at the heart of our understanding of randomness and probabilities in the world around us. Extending this understanding to domains where quantum noise cannot play this role is not a straightforward step. Our experiences might create the impression that uncorrelated (or "equipartitioned") microscopic physics is a "natural" assumption, but the reality is not so simple. For example we are quick to embrace the "past hypothesis" which requires a high level of tuning of microscopic physics to realize the low entropy properties we believe describe our past state (see e.g. [11]). So already our beliefs about assigning probabilities to microscopic states are not simple ones. It is far from obvious one can extend the simple ideas we do have about microscopic states beyond the domains in which they have proven themselves.

In summary, we have argued that all successful applications of probability to describe nature can be traced to quantum origins. Because of this, there has not been any systematic validation of purely classical probabilities, even though most of us believe we use them all the time. These matters are of particular importance in multiverse theories where truly classical probabilities are used to address critical questions which cannot be addressed by the quantum theory. Such applications of classical probabilities need to be built systematically on separate foundations and not be thought of as extensions of already proven ideas. We have yet to see purely classical probabilities motivated and validated in a compelling way, and thus are very skeptical of multiverse theories that depend on classical probabilities for their predictive power.

We are not the only ones who regard quantum probabilities as most fundamental (e.g. [12]), but there are also opposing views. In addition to the case already discussed where classical probabilities are introduced in multiverse theories to enhance predictive power (such as in [5]), some theories insert classical ideas for other reasons, often in hopes of allaying interpretational concerns (e.g. [13]). The arguments presented here make us generally doubtful of such classical formulations, since our analysis reinforces the fundamental role of quantum theory in our overall understanding of probabilities. Perhaps some of these alternate theories integrate the classical ideas sufficiently tightly with quantum piece that the everyday tests we have discussed could just as well be regarded as tests of the classical ideas in the alternate theory. However, such logic seems overly complex to us, and we prefer the simpler interpretation that the strong connection between all our experiences with probabilities and the quantum world means the quantum theory really is the defining physical theory of probabilities.

We thank E. Anderes, S. Carroll, D. Deutsch, B. Freivogel, A. Guth, L. Knox, D. Martin, J. Morgan, J. Preskill, R. Singh and W. Zurek for helpful conversations. This work was supported in part by DOE Grant DE-FG03-91ER40674 and UC Davis.

[1] P. S. Laplace, *Essai philosphique sur les probabilités* (Bachelier, 1825).
[2] A. H. Guth, J. Phys. **A40**, 6811 (2007).
[3] D. N. Page, JCAP **0907**, 008 (2009).
[4] J. H. Cooperman, JCAP **1102**, 014 (2011).
[5] M. Srednicki and J. Hartle, Phys.Rev. **D81**, 123524 (2010); D. N. Page, (2012), arXiv:1203.1837 [hep-th].
[6] In some cases "prior" probabilities are used to express our beliefs in the presence of model uncertainty. These probabilities do not represent properties of nature that can be determined through the statistical analysis of data and are not the topic of this paper.
[7] W. H. Zurek and J. P. Paz, Phys.Rev.Lett. **72**, 2508 (1994).
[8] A. A. Faisal, L. P. J. Selen, and D. M. Wolpert, Nature reviews. Neuroscience **9**, 292 (2008).
[9] S. Carroll at the *PCTS workshop on inflation* (Jan 2011).
[10] D. Bailey *et al.*, Mathematical Intelligencer **19**, 50 (1997).
[11] S. Carroll, *From Eternity to Here: The Quest for the Ultimate Theory of Time* (Oneworld Publications, 2011).
[12] D. Deutsch, (1999), arXiv:quant-ph/9906015 [quant-ph]; D. Wallace, in *Many Worlds? Everett, Quantum Theory, and Reality* (OUP, 2010); W. H. Zurek, Phys.Rev.Lett. **106**, 250402 (2011); R. Bousso and L. Susskind, Phys.Rev. **D85**, 045007 (2012).
[13] G. 't Hooft, AIP Conf.Proc. **1446**, 341 (2010); S. Weinberg, Phys.Rev. **A85**, 062116 (2012); A. Aguirre, M. Tegmark, and D. Layzer,

Phys.Rev. **D84**, 105002 (2011).